ATLANTA Economic Review

Vol. I, No. IX October 15, 1951

Prepared monthly as a service to Atlanta citizens by the Council on Economic Research, Atlanta Division, University of Georgia

PROPERTY WHICH THE STATE OF GEORGIA OWNS --- G. G. MAUGHON

Some of the property which is Georgia owned is located in the city of Atlanta, some of it like great strips of ribbon runs throughout the state in ever increasing mileage, and some of it is located in our neighboring state of Tennessee.

For instance:

Georgia owns the Western and Atlantic Railroad and its terminals in the cities of Atlanta and Chattanooga. Also certain other lands and buildings in these cities and along the line of the Western and Atlantic Railroad are Georgia owned.

The state of Georgia operated the Western and Atlantic rail line from its completion in 1850 until December 27, 1870. It is now leased to the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railroad Company at a rental of $45,000 per month. In the W & A area in Chattanooga, the state owns two hotels. The Plaza is a four-story brick building assessed at $100,000 and leased for $10,600 per year for the period ending in 1955. The Eastern hotel is a small four-story brick building assessed at $62,000 and leased for $5,400 per year during the period ending in 1950.

One the Flint and Chattahoochee rivers the state reserves "all islands contained in any of the navigable rivers of the state and not disposed of."

Title to the several institutions operated by the Board of Regents of the University System, and the several eleemosynary institutions operated by the Department of Public Welfare, is held by the state. It holds legal title to the rights-of-way of the State Highway System, and all lands and other property conveyed to or held by the State Department of Forestry and Geological Development for forestry or park purposes.

(To be continued in the next issue)

GEORGIA FARM NEWS --- M. D. DUNLAP

Due to uncertainty brought on by drouth conditions in many sections of Georgia, it is difficult to get an accurate picture of what we in Georgia may expect from our farm crops for this year, but preliminary estimates of the Georgia Crop Reporting

Service place the 1951 income, including government payments, at $529,991,000 compared with $453,574,000 the previous year. This is 43 per cent above the 1940-49 average.

Gross income, which includes products consumed on the farms, is placed at $650,030,000 compared with $578,683,000 in 1949.

CASH FARM INCOME FOR GEORGIA*
(Thousand Dollars)

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
TOTAL CROPS	292,197	356,141	350,318	291,727	326,931
Livestock and Livestock Product	120,612	157,291	169,800	155,944	192,479
Government Payments	7,412	8,542	6,395	5,903	10,580
Home Consumption					
Crops	48,889	56,917	45,837	40,071	39,519
Livestock	78,932	93,443	93,030	85,038	80,520
GROSS INCOME					
Crops	341,086	413,058	396,155	331,798	366,451
Livestock	199,544	250,734	262,830	240,982	272,999
All Commodities	540,630	663,792	658,985	572,780	639,450

DISTRIBUTION OF 1950 CASH INCOME FROM GEORGIA CROPS AND LIVESTOCK

Crops $326,932,000 - 61.7%
-- Cotton and Cotton Seed 21.9%
----------------------------- Peanuts 13.1%
-------------------------- Tobacco 9.6%
------------------------- All Other Crops 9.0%
--------- Truck Crops 3.1%
----- Fruits and Pecans 2.8%
--- Corn 2.2%

Livestock and Livestock Production $192,479,000 -- 36.3%
----------------------------- Hogs 9.8%
-------------------------- Commercial Broilers 8.6%
---------------------- Cattle and Calves 6.9%
------------------- Dairy Products 6.8%
---------- Eggs 2.9%
----- Other Livestock 1.3%
-------- Government Payments 2.0%

*Georgia Crop Reporting Service, University of Georgia, College of Agriculture.

CRISIS TO CRISIS -- G. P. W. LAMB

Mr. Winston Churchill recently summarized the achivements of England's Socialist government to date as a mere blundering from crisis to crisis.

In almost every part of the economy ample evidence could be found, and found without difficulty, to show that Mr. Churchill's phrase is accurate. For the purposes of this article, however, attention will be confined to England's balance-of-payments problem. In that matter, progress from one crisis to another has indeed been the order of the day. With unfailing regularity there occurred a major crisis in the fall of 1945, another major crisis in the fall of 1947, another major crisis in the fall of 1949--and a further major crisis impends at the present time.

For these recurrent storms there are, of course, certain obvious major reasons. One of them is the fact that for seventy-five years the state of affairs whereby England was the "workshop of the world" has been giving place to a state of affairs whereby the rest of the world has become its own workship. Another is the fact that through 1914-18, and again through 1939-45, England poured out blood and treasure in the fighting of world wars. A third is the fact that the "terms of trade" have changed to the disadvantage of countries like England which in the past lived, and in the present and the future must still live, by exchanging manufactured goods for food and raw materials. Mr. Colin Clark, for example, estimated recently that if the price of British imports be estimated in terms of the price of exports, and the price of imports in terms of the price of exports in 1913 be expressed as 100, then the index number of the "terms of trade" would be 100 for 1910-19, 80 for 1920-29, 72 for 1930-39, 84 for 1947, 94 for 1950, and 110 for 1951. Such figures are, of course, approximations only. Nobody with any knowledge of statistics would regard them as completely accurate. But the changes which they indicate are so immense, and for England's economy so disastrous, that they cannot possibly be ignored.

Unluckily, however, England's Chancellor of the Exchequer, was recently in Washington. He explained England's present difficulties in grave terms. England's "dollar gap" was reduced to 350 millions in 1950. It will probably be 1,000 millions in 1951. Meanwhile the re-armament burden increases. Already England has nearly a million men under arms and is paying 40% of her total national income in taxation. The process cannot continue indefinitely.

Talk was heard in the spring of 1951 of a revaluation of sterling, upwards, in terms of the dollar. It will not be heard in the fall.

ADVERTISING IN THE SALE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES --------------- W.R. KNIGHT

Could the demand for farm products in this country be increased by means by advertising? This question is important to many farm groups which would like to meet the frequently occurring "surplus" problem by finding effective means of moving more of their products into consumption, as well as to expand their markets generally.

It is surprising how little is known about the power of advertising in this connection. The fact that there are organizationa which spend much promoting the sale of some agricultural commodities does not prove that advertising is effective.

On contacting a half dozen state departments of agriculture and farmer's cooperatives which have a record of heavy advertising, this writer found that only one of them had made a serious effort to learn the sales results. Moreover, government and college marketing research workers have hardly touched this matter at all.

Farm groups are not alone in their quandary over advertising, for many businessmen in other lines spend money promoting their products over the radio, in the newspapers, etc., because of the precedent set by large firms. There is a widespread belief that this sort of advertising must yield good dividends, else these large firms would not engage in it; also there is a feeling that if advertising stimulates the sale of one commodity, it will do the same for others. Actually, large firms have known much less about the impact of advertising on sales than many people are prepared to believe. Because of their uncertainties, many of these firms have begun to spend substantial sums on advertising testing; much experimentation is now in progress concerning ways and means to conduct this research. Doubtless, the testing of advertising is a field of employment that will expand, and firms which are now prepared to perform this function are finding their services in demand.

The few tests which have been made to date in connection with agricultural products suggest that, in the short-run at least, non-price advertising for familiar commodities in their ordinary uses does not seem to boost sales. On the other hand, there is some evidence that the promotion of "specials" and entirely new uses for familiar products does bring a sales response. These tests have reference, not to the relative sales of one brand versus another, but rather to the total consumption of a particular commodity in a given area.

Atlanta Division
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
24 Ivy Street, S. E.
ATLANTA 3, GEORGIA

Sec. 34.66, P. L. & R.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
Permit No. 152